

NRO review completed

8 August 1968

25X1A

MEMORANDUM FOR:

SUBJECT: COMIREX-D-33.4/1, Summary of  
Nonconventional Film Systems

1. The subject is well written and presents information which I noted in my briefing we were already aware of. My problem with the paper is that it treats BIMAT film and BIMAT/DESIMAT processing as separate subjects, and nowhere in the paper does it mention my proposal for the combined use of systems already in being. Had my specific proposal been addressed, some of the wording in the reference would have changed, both in the methodology and possible advantages and disadvantages. If one were to address my specific proposal after having read this paper, it's obvious that what I said at the briefing still holds true, providing one or two small errors in the reference are corrected.

a. On Page 2, first sentence, my proposal notes that for our uses, the BIMAT transfer film is delivered from Eastman Kodak with the chemicals already imbibed; therefore, there would only be three items noted in Paragraph 1, i.e., a Kodak BIMAT transfer film pre-imbibed, suitable handling equipment, and an exposed negative film.

b. On Page 3, first sentence should either be changed or an additional sentence added stating that pre-imbibed BIMAT film, if kept refrigerated like conventional film, will last at least 6

months until ready to be used. Also on Page 3, second paragraph under Summary of Disadvantages should read for clarification, "Resolution of the BIMAT positive is limited . . . ." I would like this clarification made since my proposal incorporates the production of a conventional positive, the resolution of which is not limited any more than the conventional processed positive is limited, and in fact, the quality is frequently superior to a conventionally-produced dupe positive.

c. Next paragraph on Page 3 would read better, "BIMAT has been on the market for at least 8 years." I have the original publication put out by Kodak to the public on the availability of BIMAT dated the summer of 1960.

d. On Page 4 at the bottom of the page under Trispin, it is possible that the EXRAND is not aware that Eastman Kodak is actually producing, at their own cost, a Trispin and Pentaspin Machine, the first to be available sometime in late August and the Pentaspin to be available in late September. The point is that E.K. is so sure that the system will work, they have gone further than the design stage, and prototypes are now in production.

2. Summary: The significant point I made in my briefing is that there is little or no development left to be done in this proposed system since:

a. BIMAT has already been proven.

b. There is nothing technically left to be accomplished on the laminating and delaminating of DESIMAT tape, since the same equipment will be used that is used for the BIMAT processing.

c. That materials presently on-the-shelf and in use can continue to be used with the addition of the new DESIMAT tape and DRIMAT material if the latter is felt necessary.

d. That the other systems described in the reference are still in various stages of development, and in some cases, use new materials being developed and not presently available to the vast number of consumers in the field; whereas the proposed system has little or nothing left to be developed since the hardware involved is already available in small formats and the proposed equipment is simply an enlargement of this same equipment to handle 9 1/2" materials and smaller.

3. Doesn't EXRAND have the prerogative of making recommendations to COMOR? Can COMOR, based on the reference paper, read between the lines and by adding the facts already noted, determine that the proposed processing system, including the use of DESIMAT tape and possibly DRIMAT, is in itself a new concept contrary to the COMOR Minutes? Does COMOR understand that this system could be available in a relatively short time for producing the highest quality negatives and positives at the recovery site

available to the P.I. in a fraction of the time in which the material is presently available? Does COMOR understand that the cost of this system is very favorable and that this system, when compared with the others having the greatest degree of promise, is providing rapid high-quality processing by using on-the-shelf films giving both the tactical and strategic recce capability a quicker and more versatile processing capability than they have ever had before? If EXRAND or COMOR can understand this, then a statement by them to this effect, even in the Minutes, would probably have significant meaning to the Project Officer in the NRO who has been charged to evaluate this system and approve the funds for its manufacture and delivery.

33.4/1